

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 and 57-71 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1 and 69 are independent.

By the instant amendment, the specification is amended. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-19 and 57-71 are presented to the Examiner for further prosecution on the merits.

A. Introduction

In the outstanding Office action, mailed October 17, 2005, the Examiner objected to the specification, rejected claims 1-19 and 67-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, 15, 19 and 67-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0205868 to Yamazaki et al. ("the Yamazaki et al. reference"), rejected claims 2-3, 7-8, 11-12 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamazaki et al. reference in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0036267 to Ikeda et al. ("the Ikeda et al. reference"), rejected claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamazaki et al. reference, rejected claims 5, 14, 69 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamazaki et al. reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,916,681 to Asano et al. ("the Asano et al. reference"), and rejected claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamazaki et al. and Asano et al. references in view of the Ikeda et al. reference.

B. Objection to the Specification

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner objected to the specification, stating that "200 Brinell" recited in claims 3 and 12 must be described in the originally filed disclosure. *Office action of October 17, 2005, at page 2.*

Applicants note that the Korean language priority document, Korean Patent Application No. 2002-87940, which applicants submitted at the time the instant application was filed and incorporated by reference in paragraph [0045] of the original specification, described the hardness scale as Brinell. By the instant amendment, paragraphs [0008], [0014], [0035] and [0051] are amended to reflect this hardness scale, as the Examiner required. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

C. Asserted Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19 and 67-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner asserted that “a semiconductor chip is more complete than a thin film semiconductor device,” and required that applicants change the preamble of the claims accordingly. However, applicants respectfully submit that the terms “chip” and “device” do not have precisely defined meanings to those of ordinary skill in the art. Rather, these terms are ascribed a large range of meanings. Further, the Examiner provided no basis for characterizing a “chip” as more complete than a “device.”

In addition, applicants respectfully submit that the use of the terms “chip” and “device” in the claims is consistent with the use of these terms in the specification. Thus, even if, as the Examiner asserts, these terms are used in the claims and the specification in a manner contrary to their ordinary use, the applicants are free to act as their own lexicographers and redefine these terms. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would

find the claim language to be sufficiently definite. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

D. Asserted Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, 15, 19 and 67-68

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, 15, 19 and 67-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Yamazaki et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and submit that the Examiner failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a “flexible substrate.” In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner asserted that the Yamazaki et al. reference discloses a glass substrate, and that a glass substrate is equivalent to a flexible substrate. In particular, the Examiner asserted that a glass substrate 301 disclosed in the Yamazaki et al. reference is the same material described by applicants as a flexible substrate. *Office action of October 17, 2005, at page 2.* Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, applicants note that the section of applicant’s specification relied upon by the Examiner recites “[t]he flexible substrate may, however, be a glass substrate having a thickness less than about 100 μ m. *Specification as filed at paragraph [0012], emphasis added.* Thus, applicants did not state that *any* glass substrate is a flexible substrate. Further, the Yamazaki et al. reference does not characterize the glass substrate 301 as being flexible, nor does it disclose that the glass substrate 301 has a thickness less than about 100 μ m. Indeed, the Yamazaki et al. reference appears to clearly distinguish the glass substrate 301 from a flexible material. In particular, the Yamazaki et al. reference describes, in connection with FIG. 12, a “flexible circuit,” which is not only illustrated as a wavy

element, implying flexibility, but is also illustrated as being very much thinner than the glass substrate 301.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the Yamazaki et al. reference does not disclose or suggest a flexible glass substrate, as recited in claim 1 and, thus, the Yamazaki et al. reference fails to disclose, or even suggest, each and every element of claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable. The remaining rejected claims, viz., claims 4, 6, 10, 13, 15, 19 and 67-68, depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and are believed to be similarly allowable. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

E. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 2-3, 7-8, 11-12 and 16-17

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-3, 7-8, 11-12 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamazaki et al. reference in view of the Ikeda et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The proposed combination of the Yamazaki et al. and Ikeda et al. references fails to suggest, much less disclose, each and every element of claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Thus, as claims 2-3, 7-8, 11-12 and 16-17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, they are believed to be similarly allowable. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

F. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of claims 9 and 18

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamazaki et al. reference. In rejecting claims 9 and 18, the Examiner asserted that the thickness of less than about 100 μm recited in claims 9 and 18 is a result effective variable. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

As an initial matter, applicants restate the arguments raised above in Section B, and submit that the Yamazaki et al. reference fails to disclose, or even suggest, a “flexible substrate,” as recited in claim 1. Since claims 9 and 18 further define a “flexible substrate,” they are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Further, applicants submit that the Yamazaki et al. reference fails to recognize the significance of the thickness of the glass substrate 301. Accordingly, the thickness is not a result effective variable.

Applicants note that MPEP § 2144.05 (II) (B) requires that “a particular parameter must first be recognized as a result-effective variable, i.e., a variable which achieves a recognized result. . . .” Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner failed to meet this requirement. The Yamazaki et al. reference is silent as to the thickness of the glass substrate 301, as noted above. Accordingly, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, one of ordinary skill in the art, absent the teachings of the subject application, would not be motivated to adjust the thickness of the glass substrate 301 of the Yamazaki et al. reference to be less than about 100 μm . Thus, a glass substrate having a thickness less than about 100 μm is not obvious in view of the Yamazaki et al. reference. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

G. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of claims 5, 14, 69 and 71

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 14, 69 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamazaki et al. reference in view of the Asano et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 69 recites, in part, “a flexible substrate.” Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of the Yamazaki et al. and Asano et al. references fails to suggest, much less disclose, each and every element of independent claims 1 and 69 for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that

claim 69 is allowable. Thus, as claims 5, 14 and 71 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 69, they are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

H. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of claim 70

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamazaki et al. reference and the Asano et al. reference in view of the Ikeda et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of the Yamazaki et al., Asano et al. and Ikeda et al. references fails to suggest, much less disclose, each and every element of claim 69 for at least the reasons set forth above. Thus, as claim 70 depends from claim 69, it is believed to be similarly allowable. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

I. Entry of Amendment Requested

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and that the instant amendment overcomes the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office action. Accordingly, entry of the above amendment after final is respectfully requested.

J. Conclusion

Since the cited prior art relied on to reject the claims of the subject application fails to anticipate or render obvious the present invention, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-19 and 57-71 are in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all pending claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: February 7, 2006


Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

LEE & MORSE, P.C.
1101 WILSON BOULEVARD, SUITE 2000
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703.525.0978 TEL
703.525.4265 FAX

PETITION and
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.